

## **DRAWINGS**

A Replacement Sheet for Figure 4 is attached to this Response. The Replacement Sheet contains amendments as follows.

In Figure 4, reference numbers 193 and 293 have been removed.

## REMARKS

Claims 1-18 and 27-41 are currently pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 1, 15, and 27 are independent.

### Objection to Drawings

The drawings are objected to because:

- (1) reference number 210 is mentioned in the description but not included in Figure 4;
- (2) reference numbers 193, 293, and 201 in Figure 4 and reference numbers 12 and 22 in Figure 6 are not mentioned in the description; and
- (3) the description mentions reference numbers 10 and 20 instead of 11 and 21 in connection with Figure 4 and instead of 12 and 22 in connection with Figure 6.

Applicant respectfully submits these objections have been overcome by the above amendments to the drawings and specification and should accordingly be withdrawn.

### Objection to Specification

The title is objected to as not being descriptive. Applicant respectfully submits this objection has been overcome by the above amendment to the title and should accordingly be withdrawn.

The Office Action sets forth a reminder about proper language and format for an abstract without specifying any particular objection. If the abstract is objectionable, Applicant respectfully requests that any objection be set forth with specificity.

The specification is objected to because it does not include a brief summary of the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this objection as follows.

Applicant respectfully submits a brief summary of the invention is not required. 37 CFR 1.73 explicitly states:

A brief summary of the invention indicating its nature and substance, which may include a statement of the object of the invention, *should* precede the detailed description. Such summary *should, when set forth*, be commensurate with the invention as claimed and any object recited should be that of the invention as claimed (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that the use of the word "should" and the phrase "when set forth" clearly indicate that inclusion of a brief summary of the invention is optional rather than mandatory. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

### Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 10-15, 17-19, 21-23, 25-28, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,141,351 to Goodnow et al. ("Goodnow").

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,262,171 to Schneider et al. ("Schneider").

Claims 16, 20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodnow and Schneider.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as follows.

Claims 19-26 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant therefore respectfully submits the rejections of these claims are no longer applicable.

Independent claim 1 recites a device having a transmitter to transmit first signals in a first frequency band over one of a plurality of lines of a bus and having a receiver to receive second signals in a second frequency band over the one line of the bus while first signals are transmitted over the one line of the bus, wherein the first frequency band and the second frequency band occupy different portions of a frequency spectrum.

Independent claim 15 recites a device comprising a transmitter to transmit first signals in a first frequency band over one of a plurality of lines of a bus and a receiver to receive second signals in a second frequency band over the one line of the bus while first signals are transmitted over the one line of the bus, wherein the first frequency band and the second frequency band occupy different portions of a frequency spectrum.

Independent claim 27 recites transmitting by a device first signals in a first frequency band over one of a plurality of lines of a bus and receiving by the device second signals in a second frequency band over the one line of the bus while first signals are transmitted over the

one line of the bus, wherein the first frequency band and the second frequency band occupy different portions of a frequency spectrum.

Applicant respectfully submits none of the references cited in these rejections, whether alone or in any combination with one another, taught or suggested such features as claimed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Goodnow did not teach or suggest that any one device in Figure 1 both transmits signals in one frequency band while receiving signals in a frequency band occupying a different portion of a frequency spectrum.

Applicant also respectfully submits that Schneider taught use of a single line or cable 12 to interconnect telephone stations 10.

Applicant further respectfully submits it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined Schneider with Goodnow.

Applicant respectfully submits one of ordinary skill in the art would not have looked to a telephone system as taught by Schneider to modify a microprocessor bus system as taught by Goodnow.

Applicant also respectfully submits that Schneider taught away from combining Schneider with Goodnow. Schneider explicitly taught a station 10 can call another station 10 without requiring a central office. See, e.g., Schneider in the Abstract. Because Goodnow taught use of a central traffic controller 14 to establish communication between devices on bus 12, Applicant respectfully submits one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Schneider with Goodnow.

Noting the remaining claims depend from independent claim 1, 15, or 27, Applicant therefore respectfully submits these rejections have been overcome and should accordingly be withdrawn.

Note that there may be additional reasons for the patentability of claims. For example, there may be additional reasons why the dependent claims are patentable.

New Claims

New claims 34-41 depend from independent claim 1 or 15. Applicant therefore respectfully submits new claims 34-41 are also patentable over Goodnow and Schneider. Note that there may be additional reasons for the patentability of these new claims.

It is respectfully submitted this patent application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to help expedite the prosecution of this patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 17, 2005

/Matthew C. Fagan, Reg. No. 37,542/  
Matthew C. Fagan  
Registration No. 37,542  
Telephone: (512) 732-3936  
Facsimile: (512) 732-3912 (please call first)

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, L.L.P.  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
Telephone: (503) 439-8778  
Telephone: (310) 207-3800